

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EDDIE D. ENNIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

5:18-CV-0501
(GTS/TWD)

NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF PAROLE,
Tina Stafford, Director,

Defendant.

APPEARANCES:

EDDIE D. ENNIS

Plaintiff, *Pro Se*

114 Franklin Street, Apt. 208

Watertown, New York 13601

GLENN T. SUDDABY, Chief United States District Judge

DECISION and ORDER

Currently before the Court, in this *pro se* civil rights action filed by Eddie D. Ennis (“Plaintiff”) against the New York Department of Parole (“Defendant”), is United States Magistrate Judge Thérèse Wiley Dancks’ Report-Recommendation recommending that Plaintiff’s Complaint be dismissed unless, within forty-five days of the issuance of a Decision and Order adopting the Report-Recommendation, Plaintiff files an Amended Complaint correcting its pleading defects. (Dkt. No. 5.) Plaintiff has not filed an objection to the Report-Recommendation, and the deadline in which to do so has expired. (*See generally* Docket Sheet.) Instead, Plaintiff has filed an Amended Complaint attempting to correct the pleading defects identified by Magistrate Judge Dancks in the Report-Recommendation. (Dkt. No. 6).


After carefully reviewing the relevant papers herein, including Magistrate Judge Dancks' thorough Report-Recommendation, the Court can find no clear-error in the Report-Recommendation.¹ Magistrate Judge Dancks employed the proper standards, accurately recited the facts, and reasonably applied the law to those facts. As a result, the Report-Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety for the reasons set forth therein, and Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is accepted for filing and will be referred to Magistrate Judge Dancks for review of its pleading sufficiency pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).

ACCORDINGLY, it is

ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Dancks' Report-Recommendation (Dkt. No. 5) is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** in its entirety; and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (Dkt. No. 6) is accepted for filing and this action is referred to Magistrate Judge Dancks for review of its pleading sufficiency pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).

Dated: August 14, 2018
Syracuse, New York


HON. GLENN T. SUDDABY
Chief United States District Judge

¹ When no objection is made to a report-recommendation, the Court subjects that report-recommendation to only a clear error review. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), Advisory Committee Notes: 1983 Addition. When performing such a "clear error" review, "the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Id.*; see also *Batista v. Walker*, 94-CV-2826, 1995 WL 453299, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. July 31, 1995) (Sotomayor, J.) ("I am permitted to adopt those sections of [a magistrate judge's] report to which no specific objection is made, so long as those sections are not facially erroneous.") (internal quotation marks omitted).